

O&M Working Group Notes

March 30th 2010

Attendance:

Randy Smidt	randall.smidt@us.army.mil	US Army - ACSIM
Pete Aitcheson	pete.aitcheson@hhs.gov	HHS
Beth Shearer	beth.shearer@comcast.net	BSAI
Chris Rennick	crennick@emon.com	E-MON, LLC
Ab Ream	ab.ream@ee.doe.gov	FEMP
Ed St. Germain	egermain@emrinc.com	EMR
Bill Sandusky	bill.sandusky@pnl.gov	PNNL
Leslie Nicholls	lnicholls@energetics.com	Energetics
Lisa Hopkins	lisa.hopkins@us.ibm.com	IBM
Aly Dean	adean@energetics.com	Energetics
Andrew Crigler	andy.crigler@osd.mil	OSD
Dave Baker	bakerw@state.gov	Dept of State
Sandy Morgan	sandy.morgan@ars.usda.gov	USDA - ARS
Bill Shanks	wlshanks@tva.gov	TVA
Charles Johnson	CharlesD.Johnson@da.usda.gov	USDA
Ed Pierce (filling in for Terry Sharp)	piercefejr@ornl.gov	ORNL
Chris Cockrill	chris.cockrill@gsa.gov	GSA

Agenda:

Welcome and introductions, Ab Ream, FEMP
Meeting objectives, Ab Ream, FEMP
O&M priorities discussion, Leslie Nicholls, Energetics
Review/discussion of O&M Best Practice Guide, Bill Sandusky, PNNL
Action item recap, Leslie Nicholls, Energetics
Wrap-up and adjourn, Ab Ream, FEMP

Meeting objective:

Establish top priorities from rank list from January 28th meeting and obtain input for O&M best practices guide.

O&M Priorities Discussion: Structure and Overall Group Mission

- Discussion focused on the area of: Structure and overall group mission:
 - Establish a military sub group.
 - Establish a laboratory-specific working group.
 - Use the Labs21 energy benchmarking tool (by LBNL) as a reference.
 - Our new way to approach problems should be thinking of EO 13514 first, and then how O+M is the best way to accomplish GHG goals.

- Establish a short subgroup on budget.
 - Coordinate with other working groups like the FFC O&M group and Labs21 laboratories group.
 - Monthly teleconferences on O+M subjects to set up networking.
 - Bring O&M employees into the group: Find a few people who are good at it and ask them for their ideas (not just “I’m from Washington and I’m here to help”).
 - Metrics subgroup
- Group was instructed to think in terms of priorities, funding, time and “do ability concentrating on the structure and overall group mission activities listed above.
 - A scale of 1-5 where 1 = high priority/value 5 = low priority/value was used to facilitate the discussion.

Summary results of group discussion:

- All activities provide value. There is a question of timing and framing of specific activities.
- Near term high priority activities:
 - Defining and coordinating activities in relation to EO 13514 which defines the goals, provides foundational weight/importance for issues; and is a primary driver at this time.
 - Forming a subgroup on budget. However, this activity may need to be redefined as “resources” and cost effective approaches to achieve shared energy savings.
 - Coordinating with and leverage activities of other groups (Labs 21; Green Building Alliance; FFC; etc).
 - Outlining tools required and updating the O+M best practices guide.
- Mid-term activities:
 - Monthly teleconferences and setting up a forum to exchange ideas such as using share point technology or a password protected working group website.
 - Metrics working group to provide foundational information – you can’t manage what you can’t measure.
 - Working to identify O&M employees to provide input to the group and tool development.
- Longer term activities:
 - Forming sub groups such as a military sub group and laboratory sub group.

Individual input is summarized below listed from highest priority to lowest priority items:

Pete:

- 1) Establish a short group on budget.
- 2) Include O+M employees in group.

- 3) Establish lab specific, coordinate with other groups, and establish a metrics subgroup—all tied for third place.
- 4) Lowest priorities: establish a military subgroup, utilize Labs21, and host monthly teleconferences (too far down the road).

Lisa:

- 1) Address E.O. 13514 in a focused way of O+M to establish thought leadership on the document. The E.O. and establishing a short subgroup on budget are tied for highest priority.
- 2) Establish a metrics subgroup and align with other working groups.
- 3) Bring in O+M personnel to make sure the group is headed in the right direction.

Comment: Creating a military subgroup is a good idea but not personally ranked.

Andy:

- 1) Address E.O. 13514 in a thoughtful way.

Comment: Establishing a military subgroup a good idea. The group should not discard it but it is probably not the most important.

Sandy:

- 1) Host monthly teleconferences.
- 2) Establish a laboratory subgroup.
- 3) Establish a subgroup on budget and coordinate with other groups.
- 4) Labs21, addressing E.O. 13514, and establishing a metrics subgroup are least important.

Comment: The idea of a military subgroup should be kept with everything else. They have the same problems as everyone else.

Dave:

- 1) Address the E.O.
- 2) Utilize Labs21 benchmarking.
- 3) Coordinate with other working groups
- 4) Establish a subgroup on budget, then metrics.

Edited E-mail comments:

- O&M is often divorced from the energy conservation group by several layers of contracts and organization. Recognizing this would drive us to include performance based contract language that would motivate the O&M contractor to manage energy and establish metrics and goals for measuring energy conservation success.
- We need to consider Life Cycle Cost (LCC) calculations as the method used for facility decision making.
 - O&M personnel need to understand how they contribute to the LCC calculation. When LCC calculations are done properly energy cost will often dominate. If O&M personnel maintained data on LCC calculations for the equipment they operate, as technology improved, equipment aged, and energy cost increased the early replacement of equipment could be

identified as a good investment for the agency with an additional benefit of energy conservation.

Bill Shanks:

- 1) Teleconferences (at least until everyone is up to speed).
- 2) Bring in O+M employees.
- 3) Establish military and lab subgroups.

Charles:

- 1) Establish a laboratory subgroup
- 2) Establish a budget subgroup and bring in O+M personnel upfront are tied for second.
- 3) Establish a military subgroup and address the E.O. is tied for last.

Randy:

- 1) Bring in O+M employees, and establishing a military subgroup is tied for top priorities.
- 2) Hosting monthly teleconferences is least important.

Beth:

- 1) Establish 'thought leadership' on E.O., focus on reducing GHG emissions.
- 2) Establish a subgroup on budget, in particular to address how to retain measured and verified savings to be used for further energy and water projects allowed by EISA.
- 3) Lowest priority is establishing a military subgroup.

Chris:

- 1) Address the E.O., establish a subgroup on budget, hold monthly teleconferences, and bring in O+M employees are all high priorities.
- 2) Least important is forming a military subgroup.

Ed:

- 1) Bring in O+M employees, hold monthly teleconferences, and coordinate with other groups are all top priorities.
- 2) Establish a metrics subgroup.
- 3) Address the E.O.
- 4) Lowest priority is establishing a military subgroup.

Bill Sandusky:

- 1) Coordinate with other groups.
- 2) Bringing in O+M employees is a low priority.

Comments: Establishing subgroups is a fine idea but the group is not ready for them yet. A military subgroup inevitably will be necessary because they are such large energy consumers. We should be thinking of using metrics to leverage how we address the E.O. For purposes of the working group, we should address how we share information – we should be using SharePoint or something similar.

Ab:

- 1) Looking at the E.O. and GHG specifically, defining clearly what O+M is, and looking at metrics are all high priorities.

Comments: Teleconferences are important and in the future, bimonthly meetings might work better for purposes of the working group.

Moving forward, we need to think of 'how do we leverage all of our resources to get done what we need to get done'? And also, how can we find and bring in O+M people?

Updates to the O+M Best Practices Guide: Facilitated by Bill Sandusky

- The current version is release 2, but there is a release 3 in draft form.
- The draft will be sent to working group members with the request that at least one person from each organization provide comments. The version being sent will include graphs and pictures. The dissemination and comment period will occur within a 30 day timeframe. If the organization representative cannot get to it within the 30 day period, please provide notification that comments will not be provided. Comments and feedback should be on all facets of the guidance.
- PNNL has developed a training course on O+M which will also be sent out to each organization for one person to provide comments on. The course runs 1-1.5hrs and targets a Federal employee audience. The training course information will be sent to working group members for review and comment.
- PNNL is about to reinvigorate REM service from a few years ago. REM activities have exploded in the Federal sector recently. Washington State University will help PNNL on this based on their expansive Resource Conservation Manager training.

Action Recap:

- Ab will draft a working group mission and charter.
- Ab will draft a near term action plan for the O&M Program.
- Ab will follow up with Chirs Tremper regarding the definition of O+M; O+M ECMs; and reporting requirements included in the data collection benchmarking tool currently being developed by FEMP.
- Bill will provide the O+M best guide, in draft form, to be issued to group for review and comment.
- Bill will provide the O+M training course for distribution to the group.

Next Meeting:

May 11, 2010